



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/807,608	12/26/2001	Jack David Hammond	Q63675	2071
23373	7590	11/21/2005	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			3639	

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/807,608	HAMMOND ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Akiba K. Robinson-Boyce	3639	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 December 2001.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/26/01, 6/27/03.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Due to communications filed 12/26/01, the following is a non-final first office action.

Claims 1-35 are pending in this application and have been examined on the merits.

Claims 1-35 are rejected as follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 6-8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 27,-29, 32, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Amirpanahi (US 5,648,906).

As per claims 1, 28, Amirpanahi discloses:

sensing means for sensing the presence of a vehicle in a parking position,

(Abstract, lines 22-24, motion detector);

a housing module having:

communication means for communicating with a network, (Col. 5, lines 22-24,

shows mother board determines the parking rate for each parking space, w/Col. 13,

lines 4-6, shows that mother board has communication through a network, where

mother board is connected to the meter);

transaction means in communication with the communication means and

accessible to a user of the system, adapted to process data to effect a payment, (Col.

Art Unit: 3639

11, lines 43-60, computerized parking meter calculates the amount of time remaining on the prepaid parking card, w/ col. 12, lines 12, lines 49-50, shows that the user pays for exactly the parking time used by the user, therefore, the amount of time calculated effects the amount the user pays, where the actual meters are accessible by the user); and

processing means, in communication with the transaction means for monitoring the sensing means and for determining the payment for an overall time period during which the presence of the vehicle is sensed, (Col. 12, lines 56-59, central database computer uses amount of time along with parking rate to make payment calculations);

wherein the payment is determined according to a variable fee structure applicable to the overall time period and is effected at the end of the overall time period, (Col. 15, lines 6-19, shows that the point is moved to a correct position on the timer when the user pays for parking, also shows rate changes where fees applied to charge cards are a lower parking rate than rates applied to coin payments).

As per claim 6, Amirpanahi discloses:

wherein the overall time period is the period of time between an initial receipt of payment information and receipt by the processing means of a user-actuated parking termination signal, (Col. 11, lines 16-37, shows parking time purchased by user, then the pointer of the timer is move to indicate the amount of parking time desired upon entry of a personal ID and insertion of parking card w/ col. 12, lines 23-33, shows pointer returns to zero upon termination).

As per claim 7, Amirpanahi discloses:

Art Unit: 3639

wherein the user-actuated parking termination signal is actuated by the user, either by providing a termination instruction to the processing means through the transaction means, or by moving the vehicle out of the parking position and thereby causing the sensing means to cease to detect the presence of the vehicle in the parking position, (Col. 21, lines 5-12, turning on the parking violation light upon removal of the parked vehicle and termination is indicated to the mother board by the removal of the vehicle).

As per claim 8, Amirpanahi discloses:

wherein if the presence of the vehicle is sensed after a grace period before or after the overall time period, the processing means is adapted to communicate an infringement signal to an enforcement body over the network, (Col. 20 line 62-col. 21, line 3, turning the parking violation light on and notifying the central database and the police if the car remains parked longer than a few minutes).

As per claim 10, Amirpanahi discloses:

wherein the sensing means is adapted to sense the presence of one or more vehicles in respective one or more parking positions, (Col. 6, lines 39-46, shows a number of networked computerized parking meters where motion detectors exist in each meter).

As per claim 12, Amirpanahi discloses:

Wherein the housing further includes display means for displaying information to the user, in communication with the processing means, (col. 3, lines 47-51, liquid crystal display).

As per claims 13, 16, Amirpanahi discloses:

wherein the transaction means includes card reading means for reading credit card information and manual input/wherein the transaction means includes card reading means for reading stored value card information and manual input means for receiving a payment authorization code from the user, (Col. 3, lines 51-53, magnetic strip reader connected to a card insertion opening and numeric code pad).

As per claim 15, Amirpanahi discloses:

wherein the transaction means includes cash payment means for receiving cash payment, (Col. 3, lines 54-56, accepting nickels, dimes, quarters, etc.).

As per claim 27, Amirpanahi discloses:

Wherein the housing further includes printing means for printing a receipt for payment, (Col. 2, lines 35-39, shows an example for printing receipts).

As per claim 28, Amirpanahi discloses:

sensing means for sensing the presence of a vehicle in a parking position, (Abstract, lines 22-24, motion detector);

a hosting module having:

communication means for communicating with a network, (Col. 5, lines 22-24, shows mother board determines the parking rate for each parking space, w/Col. 13, lines 4-6, shows that mother board has communication through a network, where mother board is connected to the meter; (Col. 5, lines 22-24, shows mother board determines the parking rate for each parking space, w/Col. 13, lines 4-6, shows that

Art Unit: 3639

mother board has communication through a network, where mother board is connected to the meter);

transaction means, in communication with the communication means and accessible to a user of the system adapted to process data to effect a payment, (Col. 11, lines 43-60, computerized parking meter calculates the amount of time remaining on the prepaid parking card, w/ col. 12, lines 12, lines 49-50, shows that the user pays for exactly the parking time used by the user, therefore, the amount of time calculated effects the amount the user pays, where the actual meters are accessible by the user);

processing means, in communication with the transaction means for monitoring the sensing means and for determining the payment for an overall time period during which the presence of the vehicle is sensed, (Col. 12, lines 56-59, central database computer uses amount of time along with parking rate to make payment calculations);

wherein the payment is determined according to a variable fee structure applicable to the overall time period is effected at the end of the overall time period, (Col. 15, lines 6-19, shows that the point is moved to a correct position on the timer when the user pays for parking, also shows rate changes where fees applied to charge cards are a lower parking rate than rates applied to coin payments).

As per claim 29, Amirpanahi discloses:

Including a plurality of parking meters, (col. 6, lines 40-41, a number of networked computerized parking meters).

As per claim 32, Amirpanahi discloses:

Art Unit: 3639

monitoring a presence signal, representative of the presence or absence of a vehicle a from at least one parking bay, (Col. 13, lines 7-11, motion detector); receiving payment information from a user of said parking bay which enables a payment, (Col. 13, lines 20-25, user inserting a parking charge card after a certain period of time); selecting at least one charging rate of a plurality of charging rates, applicable over at least one respective charging period, (Col. 15, lines 15-19, rate changes setting parking charge at a lower rate for using parking charge card); determining a length of time said vehicle is present in said at least one parking bay in response to the presence signal, (col. 15, lines 6-11, mother board directs timer to move pointer to correct position on timer); determining the payment based on the selected said at least one charge rate applicable over the length of time, (Col. 15, lines 18-19, upon use of parking charge card, lowering the rate); and effecting the payment, (Col. 15, lines 57-64, indicate correct parking time upon deducting calculated fees from parking charge card).

As per claim 33, Amirpanahi discloses:

sensing the presence or absence of a vehicle in a parking position, Col. 13, lines 7-11, motion detector sensing vehicles in parked positions); selecting one or more fee charging rates from a plurality of fee charging rates applicable under one or more circumstances of use of the system, (Col. 15, lines 15-19, rate changes setting parking charge at a lower rate for using parking charge card);

Art Unit: 3639

receiving payment information relating to the payment of fees and authorisation thereof by a user of the system, (Col. 13, lines 20-25, user inserting a parking charge card after a certain period of time);

establishing a start time from which fees may be charged by the establishing of said start time being responsive to the sensing of the presence of said vehicle in said parking position; establishing a finish time beyond which fees will not be charged, the establishing of said finish time responsive to a timing termination signal actuated by said user, (col. 15, lines 6-11, mother board directs timer to move pointer to correct position on timer, w/ col. 11, lines 32-37, shows pointer on timer moved to indicate amount of parking time desired by user once the balance on the parking card is verified, and col. 12, lines 23-32, shows that the pointer of the timer is returned to zero upon termination of the parking time);

calculating fees to be received from said user based on said one or more fee charging rates applicable under said one or more circumstances of use between said start time and said finish time, (Col. 15, lines 18-19, upon use of parking charge card, lowering the rate);

using said payment information to effect receipt of a payment from said user based on said calculated fees, Col. 15, lines 57-64, indicate correct parking time upon deducting calculated fees from parking charge card).

Art Unit: 3639

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-5, 9, 14, 17, 18, 30, 31, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amirpanahi (US 5,648,906) as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of Anthonyson (US 5,737,710).

As per claim 2, Amirpanahi fails to disclose wherein the variable fee structure includes a base charging rate and a variable charging rate, the base charging rate being applicable for a first time period and, if the vehicle is sensed longer than the first time period, the variable charging rate being applicable for a second time period after the first time period, but does disclose rate changes in col. 15, lines 15-19.

However, Anthonyson discloses:

wherein the variable fee structure includes a base charging rate and a variable charging rate, the base charging rate being applicable for a first time period and, if the vehicle is sensed longer than the first time period, the variable charging rate being applicable for a second time period after the first time period, (Col. 7 lines 51-59, certain rate applies under conditions, w/ Col. 8, lines 1-6, shows that if the condition is not satisfied, other rates are applied). Anthonyson discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that during a time when a condition is satisfied, applying one rate, and then applying another rate at another time when the condition is not satisfied.

Art Unit: 3639

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to charge a base rate for a first time period, and if the vehicle is sensed longer than the first time period, to apply the variable charging rate for the second time period with the motivation of applying new charges for a parked vehicle that exceeds its parking time.

As per claim 3, Amirpanahi fails to disclose wherein the overall time period is equal to the sum of the first and second time periods, but does disclose rate changes in col. 15, lines 15-19.

However, Anthonyson discloses:

wherein the overall time period is equal to the sum of the first and second time periods, (col. 8, lines 25-29, shows the total rate for a series of time periods is applied by implementing both the first and second rates for both first repeat and second repeat number of periods). Anthonyson discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing an overall time period through the calculation of the total rate.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for the overall time period to be equal to the sum of the first and the second time periods with the motivation of showing that the total period is a combination of more than one time period.

As per claim 4, Amirpanahi fails to disclose wherein the base charging rate is constant over the first time period and the variable charging rate changes over the second time period, but does disclose rate changes in col. 15, lines 15-19.

However, Anthonyson discloses:

wherein the base charging rate is constant over the first time period and the variable charging rate changes over the second time period, (col. 8, lines 17-24, shown that rates are established and can be set, in this case, repeat can be set to the number of periods over which to use the rate , then when the second period comes, if the repeat is not set, another rate is applied). Anthonyson discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that more than one rate table may be used in the calculation of the cost of a single garage entrance and exit.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for the base charging rate is constant over the first time period and the variable charging rate changes over the second time period with the motivation of showing that the rates change according to time periods.

As per claims 5, 35, Amirpanahi fails to disclose wherein the variable charging rate increases over the second time period or wherein the variable charging rate decreases over the second time period, but does disclose rate changes in col. 15, lines 15-19.

However, Anthonyson discloses:

wherein the variable charging rate increases over the second time period/ wherein the variable charging rate decreases over the second time period, (Col. 7, lines 63-64, shows a calendar of holidays may be specified as a condition, w/col. 8, lines 3-6, shows a first rate, and a second rate, where rates are set according to conditions, therefore if the first time period is a holiday, and the second time period is not a holiday, the rate will increase as one goes from the first time period to the second, since there is

little to no charge set on holidays, and therefore, if the second time period is a holiday, the rate would therefore decrease over the second time period. Anthonyson discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that more than one rate table may be used in the calculation of the cost of a single garage entrance and exit.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for the variable charging rate increases over the second time period, or wherein the variable charging rate decreases over the second time period. with the motivation of showing that the rates change according to time periods.

As per claim 9, Amirpanahi fails to disclose wherein a nil charge rate is applicable during the grace period, but does disclose rate changes in col. 15, lines 15-19.

However, Anthonyson discloses:

wherein a nil charge rate is applicable during the grace period, (col. 8, lines 15-18, shows that if the remaining duration is less than the grace period, then the rate calculation is finished. Anthonyson discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that the limit of conditions will not be searched from the beginning, and therefore new rates will not be applied before a grace period ends.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for a nil charge rate to be applicable during the grace period with the motivation of showing no new rates are applied until a grace period ends.

As per claim 14, Amirpanahi fails to disclose wherein if the user inputs a special vehicle authorization code into the transaction means, a nil charging rate is applicable

for at least a part of the overall time period, but does disclose rate changes in col. 15, lines 15-19.

However, Anthonyson discloses:

wherein if the user inputs a special vehicle authorization code into the transaction means, a nil charging rate is applicable for at least a part of the overall time period, (col. 8, lines 6-9, discounts applied for selected classes of accounts). Anthonyson discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that rates change according to different classes of vehicles.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to charge a nil rate upon entering a special vehicle authorization with the motivation of charging a special rate for a specific type of vehicle.

As per claims 17, 30, Amirpanahi fails to disclose wherein the communication means is adapted to communicate with a financial institution for determining whether the authorisation code is valid and whether there is sufficient credit available to the user to collect the payment/wherein the communication means of each parking meter is in communication with a central control station, the central control station being adapted to receive operational information and financial transaction information from the processing means of each parking meter over the network, but does disclose collecting payment through credit card payments in Col. 3, lines 51-53.

However, Anthonyson discloses:

wherein the communication means is adapted to communicate with a financial institution for determining whether the authorisation code is valid and whether there is

Art Unit: 3639

sufficient credit available to the user to collect the payment/ wherein the communication means of each parking meter is in communication with a central control station, the central control station being adapted to receive operational information and financial transaction information from the processing means of each parking meter over the network, (Col. 1,lines 25-28, debit users bank account, w/ col. 2, lines 57-63, download stored financial information, col. 3, lines 22-35, host computer). Anthonyson discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of using this information to create a billing statement).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to communicate with a financial institution for determining whether the authorisation code is valid and whether there is sufficient credit available to the user to collect the payment and wherein the communication means of each parking meter is in communication with a central control station, the central control station being adapted to receive operational information and financial transaction information from the processing means of each parking meter over the network with the motivation of providing information that would allow a financial institution to provide adequate financial services.

As per claim 18, Amirpanahi discloses:

wherein the communication means is in communication with a central control station, the central control station being adapted to receive operational information and financial transaction information from the processing means over the network, (Col. 5, lines 22-24, shows mother board determines the parking rate for each parking space,

w/Col. 13, lines 4-6, shows that mother board has communication through a network, where mother board is connected to the meter.

As per claim 31, Amirpanahi fails to disclose wherein each parking meter is in communication with one of more local controllers, each of which is in communication with a central control station, the central control station being adapted to receive operational information and financial transaction information from the processing means of each parking meter via the one or more local controllers, but does disclose a plurality of computerized parking meters in col. 6.lines 39-41.

However, Anthonyson discloses:

each parking meter is in communication with one of more local controllers, each of which is in communication with a central control station, the central control station being adapted to receive operational information and financial transaction information from the processing means of each parking meter via the one or more local controllers, (col. 3, lines 22-34, cost information, instructions to open the gate are sent to the lane controller). Anthonyson discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that information is sent to lane controllers for the purpose of opening access to the lanes.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for each parking meter to be in communication with one of more local controllers, each of which is in communication with a central control station, the central control station being adapted to receive operational information and financial transaction information from the processing means of each parking meter via the one or

more local controllers with the motivation of allowing access to the lane upon verification with a financial institution.

6. Claims 11- are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amirpanahi (US 5,648,906) as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of Kielland (US 6,081,206).

As per claim 11, Amirpanahi fails to disclose wherein the sensing means includes at least one induction coil for each parking position, but does disclose a motion detector for sensing parked vehicles in col. 13, lines 7-11.

However, Kielland discloses:

wherein the sensing means includes at least one induction coil for each parking position, (Col. 10, lines 7-12, induction coil). Kielland discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of achieving adequate sensitivity.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include an induction coil with the sensing means with the motivation of incorporating sensing means that will improve the sensing of vehicles.

7. Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amirpanahi (US 5,648,906) as applied to claim 1 above.

As per claims 19/20/21, Amirpanahi does not specifically disclose processing means that includes memory means, and wherein the system further includes a transportable programming device adapted to interface with the processing means for reconfiguring thereof and for reading and writing data from and to the memory means/wherein the memory means includes further memory means for storing system

configuration data, but does disclose a central database computer which acts as a server in col. 13, lines 34-35 .

Official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the computing art to have processing means that includes memory means, and wherein the system further includes a transportable programming device adapted to interface with the processing means for reconfiguring thereof and for reading and writing data from and to the memory means and wherein the memory means includes further memory means for storing system configuration data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have processing means that includes memory means, and wherein the system further includes a transportable programming device adapted to interface with the processing means for reconfiguring thereof and for reading and writing data from and to the memory means, and wherein the memory means includes further memory means for storing system configuration data with the motivation of providing hardware, software, and functionality that is consistently common with central database computers that act as servers.

As per claim 22, Amirpanahi discloses:

Wherein the programming device is also adapted to interface with a data processing means of the central control means, (Col. 5, lines 22-24, shows mother board determines the parking rate for each parking space, w/Col. 13, lines 4-6, shows that mother board has communication through a network, where mother board is connected to the meter).

Art Unit: 3639

8. Claims 23-26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amirpanahi (US 5,648,906) as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of Williams (US 6,081,205).

As per claims 23-26, Amirpanahi does not specifically disclose the following:

Wherein the transaction means includes means for sensing when an access door to internal components of the housing has been opened/wherein the system further includes diagnostic means for performing diagnostic inspection thereof/ wherein the diagnostic means of each parking meter includes fault-condition monitoring and counting means, for fault monitoring and storing fault-related data/wherein the diagnostic means is controlled by the processing means and is adapted to transmit the fault-related data to the control station through communications network, but does disclose a sensor for detecting the parked cars in col. 6, lines 41-46.

However, Williams discloses:

Wherein the transaction means includes means for sensing when an access door to internal components of the housing has been opened/wherein the system further includes diagnostic means for performing diagnostic inspection thereof/ wherein the diagnostic means of each parking meter includes fault-condition monitoring and counting means, for fault monitoring and storing fault-related data/wherein the diagnostic means is controlled by the processing means and is adapted to transmit the fault-related data to the control station through communications network, (Col. 2, lines 27-36, shows a ground fault interrupt switch interconnected between the power source and the remainder of the system to cut off power to the parking meter system in the

even of an accident or damage to the meter system, in this case opening the access door to internal components is in the same category as damage to the meter since this is an unusual condition that happens to the meter, in addition, accident or damage represents fault data, and in this case this data must be stored in order for the system to recognize fault, take proper action, and accident or damage information is sent through a communications network to transmit information from the meter to the control station, and in order to detect damage, diagnostic means must be present). Williams discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that the meter is equipped with means for detecting and handling of accidents or damage to the meter.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to incorporate all of the above limitations with the motivation of supplying a meter that would be able to diagnose its problems.

9. Claim 34, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amirpanahi (US 5,648,906) as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of Williams (US 6,081,205), and further in view of Anthonyson (US 5,737,710).

As per claim 34, Amirpanahi discloses:

providing one or more parking meters according to claim 22 to monitor utilisation of the parking positions, (Col. 6, lines 39-46, using a motion detector on a number of networked computerized parking meters):

providing a connection o each parking meter through a communications network, to a control station having processing means, (Col. 16, lines 57-63, parking meters

connected to the central database computer and the central database computer having control over thousands of meters);

causing each parking meter to store operational data relating to payment transactions performed by that parking meter, (Col. 11, lines 28-32, scanning information from parking charge card to the motherboard on the meter);

Amirpanahi fails to disclose the following, but does disclose a sensor for detecting the parked cars in col. 6, lines 41-46.

However, Williams discloses:

causing each parking meter to regularly perform self-diagnostic tests and to store data relating to those tests/ causing the parking meters to transmit the data relating to the self diagnostic tests or the operational data to the control station in real time, (Col. 2, lines 27-36, shows a ground fault interrupt switch interconnected between the power source and the remainder of the system to cut off power to the parking meter system in the even of an accident or damage to the meter system, in this case opening the access door to internal components is in the same category as damage to the meter since this is an unusual condition that happens to the meter, in addition, accident or damage represents fault data, and in this case this data must be stored in order for the system to recognize fault, take proper action, and accident or damage information is sent through a communications network to transmit information from the meter to the control station, and in order to detect damage, diagnostic means must be present). Williams discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that the meter is equipped with means for detecting and handling of accidents or damage to the meter.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to incorporate all of the above limitations with the motivation of supplying a meter that would be able to diagnose its problems.

Neither Amirpanahi, nor Williams discloses the following, but Amirpanahi discloses an LCD display for outputting information related to parking status in col. 18, lines 15-24.

However, Anthonyson discloses:

and, at the control station, processing said data in real time for producing one or more reports based on the processed data, (Col. 11, lines 32-34, generating reports). Anthonyson discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that information on parking activity by time of day, length of stay, cost and the like are produced via data report module.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to process data in real time of the producing one or more reports based on the processed data with the motivation of allowing the physical output of parking data.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Akiba K Robinson-Boyce whose telephone number is 571-272-6734. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday 8:30am-5pm, and Wednesday, 8:30 am-12:30 pm.

Art Unit: 3639

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7238 [After final communications, labeled "Box AF"], 703-746-7239 [Official Communications], and 703-746-7150 [Informal/Draft Communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"].

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

QWB

A. R. B.
November 7, 2005